AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2021 *No. 179*

House of Representatives

The House met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, speak to us this day. Call us. Call us together as people of faith and inspire us to take the time to encourage each other with testimonies of Your grace and to share our experiences of Your abiding love.

Then, when we find ourselves discouraged by the success of wrongdoers, frustrated by the smugness of the proud, and offended when the impudent put You to the test and walk away unrepentant, because we are sure of Your ultimate word, we will not accuse You of indifference.

If we ground ourselves in Your gracious plan, even when confronted with confusion, we need not question whether our devotion to You is in vain.

In all that we encounter, may we be quick to recall Your define mercy and steadfast promises. May we be assured, and may we share that assurance with those around us, that in all things and in all times, we are Yours. We are Your special possession.

We dedicate ourselves to serve You with perseverance and faithfulness this day.

In Your strength we go forth, and in Your name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

☐ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of California) at 4 p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2119, FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND SERVICES IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3110, PROVIDING URGENT MATERNAL PROTECTIONS FOR NURSING MOTHERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3992, PROTECT OLDER JOB APPLICANTS ACT OF 2021; RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 1301, PROMOTING PHYSICAL ACTIVITY FOR AMERICANS ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 117–137) on the resolution (H. Res. 716) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2119) to amend the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act to make improvements; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3110) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to expand access to breastfeeding accommodations in the workplace, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3992) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to prohibit employers from limiting, segregating, or classifying applicants for employment; relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 1301) to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of physical activity recommendations for Americans; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2119, FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND SERVICES IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3110, PROVIDING URGENT MATERNAL PROTECTIONS FOR NURSING MOTHERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3992, PROTECT OLDER JOB APPLICANTS ACT OF 2021; RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 1301, PROMOTING PHYSICAL ACTIVITY FOR AMERICANS ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 716 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 716

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2119) to amend the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act to make improvements. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–15, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3110) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to expand access to breastfeeding accommodations in the workplace, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 6 of this resolution; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. After debate pursuant to section 5 of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules are waived.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3992) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to prohibit employers from limiting, segregating, or classifying applicants for employment. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–14 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 8 of this resolution; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 8. After debate pursuant to section 7 of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part E of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part E of the report of the Committee on Rules are waived.

SEC. 9. The House hereby concurs in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 1301) to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of physical activity recommendations for Americans.

SEC. 10. (a) At any time through the legislative day of Friday, October 22, 2021, the Speaker may entertain motions offered by the Majority Leader or a designee that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV with respect to multiple measures described in subsection (b), and the Chair shall put the question on any such motion without debate or intervening motion.

(b) A measure referred to in subsection (a) includes any measure that was the object of a motion to suspend the rules on the legislative day of July 26, 2021, September 29, 2021, October 19, 2021, October 20, 2021, October 21, 2021, or October 22, 2021, in the form as so offered, on which the yeas and nays were ordered and further proceedings postponed pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX.

(c) Upon the offering of a motion pursuant to subsection (a) concerning multiple measures, the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions to suspend the rules with respect to such measures is vacated to the end that all such motions are considered as withdrawn.

SEC. 11. House Resolution 188, agreed to March 8, 2021 (as most recently amended by House Resolution 667, agreed to September 21, 2021), is amended by striking ''October 27, 2021'' each place it appears and inserting (in each instance) ''November 18, 2021''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 716, for four measures.

First, it provides for consideration of H.R. 2119, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Improvement Act, under a structured rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman SCOTT, provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, makes in order eight amendments, provides en bloc authority, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3110, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act, under a structured rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman SCOTT, provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, makes in order two amendments, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3992, the Protecting Older Job Applicants Act, under a structured rule. It provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, makes in order two amendments, and provides one motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule provides that the House hereby concurs in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 1301, an increase of the public debt limit.

Finally, the rule provides the majority leader or his designee the ability to en bloc requested roll call votes on previously considered suspension bills through October 22, 2021, and provides recess instructions, suspension authority, and same day authority through November 18, 2021.

Mr. Speaker, Republican Teddy Roosevelt once said: ''The government is us; we are the government, you and I.''

He knew that government is at its best when it brings all of us together while also working for every single one of us. That means a system that allows every American the chance to put a roof over their head, food on their table, and a job that allows them to put some money in the bank, and where education and healthcare are affordable and not a luxury for the precious wealthy few.

Unfortunately, as a deadline loomed, those discussions have had to give way to a debate about whether our Nation will pay its debts. Rather than coming together to get this done, some on the other side advocated an approach that would stop government in its tracks and open the door on default for the first time in our history.

We all know what that would mean. It would send our economy off a cliff and make the cost of virtually everything skyrocket, all at a time when we should be helping families recover from the economic shock of the COVID pandemic.

Last week our Defense Secretary, Lloyd Austin, said that defaulting our debt would risk the benefits of more than 2 million military retirees and roughly 400,000 survivors.

Mark Zandi is chief economist at Moody's Analytics and previously worked for Republican Senator John McCain. He recently said that defaulting ''would be financial Armageddon.'' That is what has been at stake here, Mr. Speaker, financial Armageddon.

□ 1615

The debt ceiling has been raised or suspended roughly 80 times in our Nation's history, often in a bipartisan way. And I am grateful that, after much debate, we are finally doing the right thing again here today.

I took to the House floor two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, and stressed the importance of preventing default. I spoke about how I voted to raise the debt ceiling when I was in the majority and in the minority, when there was a Democrat in the White House and when there was a Republican in the White House, and I asked Republicans to do one thing: If they weren't going to help us raise the debt ceiling, I asked them to get out of the way so that Democrats could prevent default on our own.

Now, I want to thank the minority leader in the Senate, MITCH MCCONNELL, for taking that advice. He crafted the initial framework of a deal that will temporarily increase our debt limit into early December. And after voting with just 10 other Republicans to allow debate on that compromise, he got so far out of the way that he couldn't even bring himself to vote for the deal that he pushed for.

But the deal was made, and the compromise passed the Senate, and I am hopeful that we can send this bill to the President today and avert a totally self-made, unnecessary catastrophe.

And let me say, for the record, the first time we saw a dramatic increase in our Nation's debt was under President Ronald Reagan, a Republican, who added $4 trillion to our Nation's debt; part of that was to pass tax cuts, again, primarily for those at the top.

So please spare us the lectures on taxes and spending today. Let's just finally do the right thing.

I want to thank all of those who will join with us today in making this possible. I pray that those who vote ''no'' will have their wisdom enlarged because what is before us is ultimately a stopgap. We will need to find a long-term solution in a matter of weeks; one that protects the full faith and credit of the United States, hopefully, without lurching from one short-term deadline to the next.

That is one of the most basic tasks of Congress and, on behalf of our economy and the American people, we will have to get this done. We always have. And we cannot afford not to this time around.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, let me also urge passage of the three underlying bills that are also included in this rule; legislation that will extend protections for nursing mothers in the workplace, prevent discrimination of older Americans in the workforce, and combat intimate partner violence. They are important ways for us all to show our support for protecting our Nation's children, families, and workers.

I urge all my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bills. Let's show that the words of Teddy Roosevelt haven't completely fallen on deaf ears. Let's show that America pays its bills; and let's show that we can keep making government work better for every single American.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 716 provides for the consideration of four bills, including an irresponsible extension of the Federal debt limit and two bills that would have questionable consequences for small businesses.

I am most concerned about S. 1301, which serves as the vehicle for an extension of the Federal debt limit until December 3. This accomplishes nothing more than kicking the can down the road on something that should be addressed now.

Given the majority's insistence on passing several multi-trillion-dollar spending packages—Democrats are now in control of the House, Senate, and White House—they can pass a debt limit extension using their majority since it is their policies that are requiring substantially larger and earlier increases to the debt limit.

In the past, when Congress was required to raise the debt ceiling, the two parties were able to negotiate a bipartisan path forward. Democrats simply refuse to work with House Republicans, despite having many opportunities to do so. Instead, they are determined to ram a $3.5 trillion spending bill checking off every item on their socialist wish list.

I am equally incensed that Democrats won't even give the debt limit extension a proper debate or vote on the House floor. Instead, this rule will deem the debt limit extension passed. This is an insult to the Members of this body who are being denied the opportunity to fully consider the gravity of extending the debt limit to account for increasing unnecessary spending. It is absolutely unacceptable to run Congress in this fashion.

The second bill up for consideration under this rule is H.R. 3110, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act.

Nursing mothers deserve protections in the workplace, which is why we already have strong laws in place to ensure reasonable break time and access to private, non-bathroom locations. This bill imposes a one-size-fits-all requirement for employers and includes penalties for employer violations.

Mr. Speaker, our small businesses have suffered through enough new burdensome regulations as they fought to survive over the last year. There is no need to duplicate existing law.

The third bill included in this rule is H.R. 3992, the Protect Older Job Applicants Act, which expands the definition in the existing Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to include applicants for employment as a protected class.

To be clear, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act already prohibits age discrimination in hiring, making this legislation redundant and unnecessary. Under the scope of this new proposed legislation, employers using common recruiting practices like internships and job fairs could be accused of discriminating against older workers, as older workers are less likely to participate in these opportunities than young Americans entering the workforce for the first time.

This bill is just a murky expansion of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. The only impact this legislation will have is on the number of lawsuits brought against American businesses.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the fourth bill up for consideration under this rule is H.R. 2119, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Improvement Act of 2021. The Family Violence Prevention and Services program does critical work to support victims of family violence, and many of my colleagues and I support reauthorizing this program in its current form.

Unfortunately, this is another example of the majority working alone to draft legislation rather than working in a bipartisan fashion to put together a bill we can all support.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned about a provision in this bill that could allow funds from this program, funds that should be going to support victims of violence, to be used for abortion services now that the Hyde amendment was stripped out of the annual appropriations bill. This is obviously troubling, and we cannot allow a pathway for taxpayer dollars to fund abortion.

Mr. Speaker, there is much to be concerned about in these four bills; most troubling of which is the temporary increase to the Federal debt limit, which is happening for no other reason than the Democrats' own mistakes.

They have worked alone on everything else. They have chosen not to be bipartisan to resolve the issues facing our country. Instead, they have chosen to push through partisan proposals while kicking critical issues down the road.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying bills.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me remind my good friend that the compromise we are voting on was designed by Republican leader MITCH MCCONNELL. It is not what I wanted. I wanted to get this out of the way and make it longer, quite frankly, so we weren't lurching from one deadline to another.

I would also say to my friend on the Rules Committee that it is a little bit hard for us to stand over here and to listen to some of my Republican colleagues complain, because what we are doing here is we are paying for the bills that Donald Trump and the Republicans accumulated.

I didn't like the tax cut that my friends forced through, by the way, with no Democratic support or consultation. It added trillions to our debt. But we have to pay for it.

It is like my Republican friends went out to a fancy restaurant, drank champagne and ate caviar and ran out of the restaurant before paying the bill, and now they want us to take the responsibility to pay for their bills.

Well, you know what? We have some experience in cleaning up the messes that have been left behind by our Republican colleagues. The last time Republicans controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House, they shut the government down, and then the new Democratic majority had to come in and try to fix all that. So my friends are really good at creating messes and piling up big bills, by the way, and then they say to us, you clean it up.

Well, you know what? We are putting our country first, and so we are going to clean up this mess, and we are going to move forward. And we are going to have a reconciliation bill, by the way, that will be mostly paid for. And if my friends don't like that, they can vote against it.

But let's be clear. Ninety-seven percent of what we are covering here are bills accumulated by Donald Trump and my Republican friends; I mean, 97 percent. So I don't know what the controversy is on the other side of the aisle.

You didn't want to accumulate all this debt? I remember during the tax debate we were talking to you about debt and you didn't want to hear anything about it. We had some Republicans say that debt doesn't matter on this floor. And now all of a sudden it does; now that we have a Democratic President and, by the way, a Democratic Congress that is trying to pay the bills that you accumulated. This is ridiculous. It is absurd that we are having this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is our debt. It is America's debt.

Now, I agree with the chairman of the Rules Committee that some of this debt clearly accumulates from tax cuts, cutting our revenue before we cut our spending. And some of it relates to greater spending promoted by both sides of the aisle.

For any one of us to get up and say it is your debt—it is America's debt, and America pays its bills.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I have faced this question of raising or suspending the debt limit 49 times. This will be the 50th time since I was first asked to vote on this question when Ronald Reagan was President of the United States.

Now, the gentlewoman is talking, Mr. Speaker, to her staff, but I want to say that the argument that she offered with references to why it is our debt is specious, and I emphatically deny that assertion.

It is our debt. We have different priorities, different perspectives, different mandates. But every time we cut revenues or we approve spending, we raise the debt limit.

And by the way, the gentlewoman was not here in the last Congress, but we accumulated $5.4 trillion in debt. And the gentlewoman may be reminded that they were passed in a bipartisan way to meet a crisis that we thought justified those expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends across the aisle have been asked to take this same vote many times as well, and they have voted ''yes'' on some of those occasions and ''no'' on others.

Nobody has clean hands when it comes to the debt limit. We all tend to rationalize that it is somebody else's debt. Let me repeat: It is our debt, America's debt.

And I will tell you this: I would hope that if only one of us of our 435, if only one of us had the decision to make as to whether we increase the debt limit or not, I hope that not a single one of us would say no.

□ 1630

Now, collectively, we apparently can rationalize saying no because somebody else will get it done. Somebody else will take the responsibility. Somebody else will act responsibly.

Mr. Speaker, the previous Speakers, I am sure although not here, perhaps have followed politics relatively closely. I have been here for a number of administrations. Ronald Reagan asked us to increase the debt. George H.W. Bush asked us to increase the debt. Bill Clinton asked us to increase the debt. George W. Bush asked us to increase the debt. Barack Obama asked us to increase the debt. Donald Trump asked us to increase the debt.

And now Joe Biden asks us to do the same. Why? Because the catastrophic alternative is unacceptable. Perhaps nobody is listening. But every Secretary of the Treasury, Republican and Democrat, has risen to the Congress of the United States and the American people and said: You must raise the debt or we will invite recession or perhaps depression and global chaos in the fiscal marketplace.

I don't see any animation from those who listened to that number or that assertion, and I am glad to have any one of them get up and try to deny that every President over the last 40 years that I have been here has asked us not to put the full faith and credit of the United States at risk.

Fifty times in 40 years. Every time we have made a determination, every time—Democrats and Republicans often together in common cause—that the full faith and credit of the United States must never even be questioned. The 14th Amendment says that, Mr. Speaker. It has been our shared determination as responsible parties loyal to Constitution and country that the costs we have incurred on behalf of the American people must be paid.

And so many of the Republicans will vote today not to do that. And they will use some rationalization that they don't like the rest of the rule or this bill or that bill. Vote against them. But don't vote against your country's full faith and credit. Don't vote against your country's credit.

Preventing a default was the obligation of Members from both parties together. That is what all the Secretaries of Treasury have said. Sometimes a number of us on one side or the other would vote against it to lodge our concerns about fiscal policies of the day as long as it was clear that somebody else would get it done.

Together, Democrats and Republicans would make sure the debt limit was raised or suspended when needed and that default was never a possibility.

I want to thank Representative FOSTER and Representative BOYLE and others who have introduced legislation that would eliminate the debt ceiling altogether. It is a phony issue. It is a fraud. It is fake news. And to think otherwise is intellectually not correct.

We ought to think about eliminating this debt limit because all it does is have a threat to global instability; something we ought to consider very seriously given how the debt limit has in recent years been dangerously weaponized by one party to hold the country hostage.

Republicans first did that in 2011, even though they were in the House majority, and the result was the first-ever downgrade of America's credit rating. Of course, that same party sang a very different tune when it was in the White House. When Donald Trump sat in the Oval Office, Democrats were asked three times by your party to help not default on the debt, and three times Democrats overwhelmingly responded.

Now President Biden has asked us to do the same thing, take action on the debt limit to ensure that a default does not happen in the coming months.

I don't like this deal that the Senate sent us. If I were voting on the merits of this deal, I would vote ''no.'' It is a lousy deal. It holds hostage the debt and credit of the United States for another 2 months, and then we are going to play this game one more time; a despicable and irresponsible act for adults who know better.

While it is a relief to so many American business workers that the threat of default has now been pushed back just a little bit, that relief will surely be short-lived because we will find ourselves here again in a month's time faced with the same situation in which we found ourselves these past weeks.

That did not happen during the Trump administration because this side of the aisle was responsible. This side of the aisle knew the truth. This side of the aisle was not very happy with the President of the United States, but happy with America's creditworthiness. One party has played partisan games with the full faith and credit of our country, refusing to act responsibly as we all have so many, many times before.

Mr. Speaker, between now and December 3, America will be watching Leaders MCCARTHY and MCCONNELL to see if they will lead their party down the responsible path or continue to play the game that has already pushed us to the brink of default. Let me be clear, I will urge my colleagues on my side of the aisle not to play that game in this administration or future administrations.

This is not about politics. This is about responsibility. This is about our country. This is, indeed, about the global fiscal health. We will continue to do the responsible thing and urge a longer term suspension of the debt limit so that we can get our country through the pandemic's economic crisis and build back better.

Even the possibility of a default, Mr. Speaker, risks harming our economic recovery. 194 sitting Democratic Members of this House, myself included, answered the call to help suspend the debt limit under President Trump. Apparently, you don't care about that. You think, well, yes, that was the responsible thing to do because we had a Republican President, but not now when we have a Democratic President. I hope the voters of America think that hypocrisy is not acceptable.

Others in our caucus who were not here at the time to take those votes, surely would have acted the same under the circumstances. 194 of us, not some few of us, but 194 of us voted for it.

The roll is going to be called, and not up yonder, but here. And I hope so many of you are there when that roll is called. Leader MCCONNELL knows it is the right thing to do. These are Senator MCCONNELL's words: ''Let me make it perfectly clear.''

Hear me, my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and hopefully our people, Mr. MCCONNELL, the minority leader in the United States Senate, the Republican leader: ''Let me make it perfectly clear,'' he said, ''the country must never default. The debt ceiling will need to be raised.'' He didn't say unless you stop pushing your policies, Democrats, that you ran on to help people, to help children, to help businesses. He didn't say that. He said, the debt limit must be raised.

In 2015 when Republicans were in the majority and asked Democrats to join them in voting to address the debt limit, he tweeted again—this is Senator MCCONNELL, the leader of the Republican Party on the Senate side, ''When the United States makes promises, it keeps them, which is why the House voted today to avoid the threat of a debt default,'' with the overwhelming majority of us joining in that responsible action.

I hope Leaders MCCARTHY and MCCONNELL and their House and Senate Republican colleagues will reject hypocrisy and embrace responsibility by joining with Democrats before December 3 to eliminate the threat of default this time and before December 3, after this bill passes, to ensure that our country pays for what it has already bought.

Now, I would simply add to the observations of the Rules Committee chairman, for whom I have not only respect but affection, I say to Mr. Chairman: We both went into that restaurant. We both got a steak. Neither one of us ought to leave without paying the bill. It wasn't just you that went and got the steak. We got a steak, too. And we both have the responsibility to pay for that steak. That is what this vote is about.

Do not hide behind some differences you may have on the three bills, as the gentlewoman, Mr. Speaker, referred us to. Don't hide behind that. This is about whether or not we are going to be fiscally responsible or not. And you can vote against those bills when they come to the floor—and I am going to bring all three of them to the floor. I will tell you that—and you can vote against them.

But do not vote against the good faith and credit of the United States of America, our country. Don't hide behind some facade that somehow we created the debt and you had no responsibility. Don't hide behind some facade that somehow we are going to offer something that has a whole lot of money coming to it because, very frankly, if that had been the case, Democrats would not have joined you under Donald Trump and raising the debt limit so we did not default.

Vote as an American; not as a Republican or Democrat. Vote as a responsible human being sent here by your neighbors and friends to do the right thing. You know in your hearts the right thing is to not allow this country's full faith and credit to be compromised in any way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my colleague on the Rules Committee that I stated very clearly that I was talking about House Republicans. But I do want to point out that no Republican in the Senate voted for this debt limit extension in addition to that, and I appreciate the majority leader's words. He gave us a history lesson about the debt limit and the votes and about not playing politics, but I just want to, before we move on, remind everyone about a quote from then-Senator and now President Biden. It was from 2004, during President Bush's Presidency and then-Senator Biden said: ''My symbolic vote against raising the debt limit would have been a protest of the policies that brought us to this point, and I demand that we change course.''

So this has not always been as bipartisan as the majority leader made it appear.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Person Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. This rule provides for debate on H.R. 3110, which, as you know, is entitled the PUMP For Nursing Mothers Act, and I am very concerned this majority doesn't seem to be concerned about the men around the country who identify as nursing mothers.

Does not the title of this act violate the rules of this 117th Congress because it recognizes distinction between men and women in biological terms? Would not this act be required to be called the pump for nursing persons act or the pump for nursing birthing persons act? I am very concerned that we are not concerned about the men around the country who identify as nursing mothers and how we would allow a debate on this bill or this act as presented.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman is recognized for his remaining time.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Well, I am just very concerned that we would have this kind of debate that is inconsistent with the apparent rules of the 117th House, and Person Speaker, I just don't think it should be permitted that we would have this kind of debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just state for the record that the House rules do not ban the use of any of the words that the gentleman is referring to. It is another one of these rightwing conspiracies.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

□ 1645

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, for his ongoing leadership to bring this important legislation to the floor, and for the work of the Rules Committee ongoing to make sure that we have the right discussion on the floor to meet the needs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, multiple times now, the Democratic House has taken action to honor our responsibility to address the priority of the debt limit. We have done so because this is about protecting families.

The failure to lift the debt limit could result in the loss of up to 6 million jobs, the elimination of $15 trillion in household wealth, and drastic increases in the cost of car loans, mortgages, student loans, credit card bills, and other borrowing.

Our action also protects the American economy. When we say domestic economy, we are talking domestic, we are talking kitchen table when we talk about car loans, mortgages, student loans, credit card bills, et cetera, as well as jobs and trillions of dollars in household wealth.

In terms of the domestic economy at large, our action protects the economy, preventing a decline in the real GDP of up to 4 percent, a surge in the unemployment rate, as I mentioned, and what JPMorgan Chase CEO Jamie Dimon called a: ''catastrophe of unbelievable proportions and damage to America for up to 100 years.''

This is also about the health of the global economy; kitchen table economy, broader domestic economy, national economy, the global economy.

The Council of Economic Advisors has stated: ''A default would send shock waves through global financial markets and would likely cause credit markets worldwide to freeze up and stock markets to plunge. Employers around the world would likely have to begin laying off workers.''

It goes on to say: ''The 2008 financial crisis had ripple effects throughout the global economy that ricocheted back to the U.S. shores, causing firms to lay off workers and cut private investment. A financial crisis driven by a default has the potential to be even worse, in addition to hitting a global economy not fully recovered from the pandemic.''

Addressing the debt limit honors our duty to the Constitution. The 14th Amendment, Section 4, states: ''The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law . . . shall not be questioned.''

My question, Mr. Speaker, to you and to our colleagues, is: What is it that they have against families, when they want to increase unemployment, decrease household wealth, and have families be charged more for car loans, credit card loans, mortgage payments, and other borrowing?

Don't you care about that?

What do you have against our own economy, where this catastrophe of unbelievable proportion could have impact for over 100 years?

Don't you care about that?

Also, the health of the global economy, which I described so clearly causing credit markets worldwide to freeze up and stock markets to plunge and employers around the world have to begin laying off workers, again, coming back to our shores.

Certainly, you have respect for the Constitution of the United States to which we take an oath to protect and defend, which states: ''The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law . . . shall not be questioned.''

Let us be clear about what this means. Addressing the debt limit is not about future spending, as some have tried to represent. This is about meeting obligations that the Government has already incurred, including from the bipartisan COVID relief legislation passed last year. Only 3 percent of the current debt that we are addressing here has been incurred during the Biden years. We are talking about the Trump debt incurred and some of it in a bipartisan way to address the COVID crisis. Not all, though. We were not complicit in the Republican tax scam to give 83 percent of benefits to the top 1 percent in our country, adding about $2 trillion that we have to cover here now.

Let us remember: This should not be controversial. The debt limit has been a longtime bipartisan issue. Congress has addressed the debt limit 78 times since 1960: 29 times with a Democratic President in the White House and 49 times under a Republican President, almost twice as many times under a Republican President.

But it has always been bipartisan. It has not always been unanimous. People have registered their concerns and their complaints. But up until now, they haven't stood in the way of passing legislation.

More recently, in 2011, each of the seven times that the debt limit was addressed, Congress did so on a bipartisan basis. This includes three times under the last administration, when Democrats cooperated in order to protect the economy from catastrophe.

I want to remind us that when President Obama was President and the Republican majority in the Congress was threatening to not lift the debt limit, just the threat of that had an impact on our credit rating. Our credit rating went down. The mere discussion of not lifting the debt limit had a negative impact on our credit rating.

Don't you care about that?

It is sad that Republican obstruction has delayed action for so long, and it is sad that they will not join us for a longer-term suspension.

The full faith and credit of the United States must never be questioned and the financial security of families must never be gambled with, as our Republican colleagues seem to be doing, even though, as Mr. HOYER mentioned, that Mr. MCCONNELL at one point was saying was playing Russian roulette with the economy.

Russian roulette from Moscow MITCH. Interesting.

Democrats are for the people. I urge a strong bipartisan vote for this legislation and for protecting the economic strength of America's working families.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman for bringing this to the floor and ask for a unanimous vote on this important legislation.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this is a lot of money that we are talking about. But it is not just the volumes of money; it is the velocity with which we are spending money over these last 2 years.

Yes, the coronavirus is terrible. Yes, the American economy needed some help. But we passed the big American Rescue Plan in February, and the States and municipalities, as of this date, have spent 2.5 percent of that money.

I am also on the Energy and Commerce Committee. We are one of the principal authorizing committees in the United States House of Representatives. Have we had a single hearing on how much money we have pushed out to the healthcare sector, to the States, to the municipalities? No, we have not.

Have we had a single hearing of what is likely to be required going forward? The answer is: No, we have not.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter I penned to FRANK PALLONE, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, asking him can we please do just a modicum of the oversight that we are required to do in the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, October 7, 2021.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE, Jr.,
Chairman, Energy and Commerce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PALLONE: I urge you to hold a hearing on the implementation of the American Rescue Plan, so that we may fulfil the oversight responsibilities of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Nearly seven months have passed since the enactment of the American Rescue Plan, but despite costing the American taxpayer $1.9 trillion, many Americans have yet to feel or recognize its effects. As the House committee with jurisdiction over the Department of Health and Human Services, the agency responsible for allocating many of these funds, it is only reasonable that proper oversight is enforced to ensure Congressional intent is practiced and the taxpayer dollar used accordingly during implementation.

During consideration of the American Rescue Plan, many lawmakers heard from states and localities on the urgent need for emergency funding. While I do not doubt that many localities were in need of assistance, it was reported that as of this summer, most had spent only 2.5% of the $350 billion that was appropriated to states and localities in the American Rescue Plan.

I understand this large sum of funds will take time to properly distribute, and states and localities must be prudent and spend allocations in ways which will prove to be an investment and grant long-term security, but it is imperative that these funds have adequate direction from Congress stipulating the appropriateness of their expenditure. States and localities need certainty that they are spending funds as directed and that these funds will not be at risk of being revoked for improper use. Fortunately, as directed by Section 602 of the American Rescue Plan, the Treasury Department is requiring expenditure reports with an interim report for all states and localities having been due on August 31, 2021, and quarterly reports starting October 31, 2021 for states and cities with populations of 250,000 residents or more.

I am afraid that Congress and the American people may lose sight of the significance that $1.9 trillion in one single stimulus package may mean and the responsibility associated with appropriating such funds. While these funds were appropriated with the intention of helping communities recover from and respond to the devastation of the COVID–19 pandemic, it is important that the American people are aware of specific projects being funded by this package. I have read reports of the American Rescue Plan being used by cities to buy 78 electric vehicles, build technology labs at recreation centers, and fund long avoided infrastructure projects. Although these projects may have merit, are they really the intent of the American Rescue Plan?

It has been a tumultuous and difficult year for Americans across the country, with businesses, schools, and social endeavors operating different than the norm—Congress and the Energy and Commerce Committee have been no different. However, as we continue to consider historically large spending packages, we have an obligation to our Constituents to oversee the implementation and use of these funds.

Sincerely,
MICHAEL C. BURGESS, M.D.,
Member of Congress.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard over and over again that what awaits is a manufactured crisis. The American people have some experience now dealing with manufactured crises. Since January of this year, they have seen a never-ending array of manufactured crises.

Look, I live in Texas. It is a border State. There are a lot of problems on the southern border. We hear about it every time we turn on the news.

The border wall was supposed to be built. It was to help that problem. But there are stacks and stacks of material to build that border wall that are just sitting because the current administration has put a pause on all of that and said we are not building any more.

What is going to happen to all of that material, that material that was paid for with borrowed money that, yes, is part of the debt? What is going to happen to that? It is going to be stolen; it is going to be diverted to some other use, probably to no good end.

But had that wall been in place, maybe the streams of people that were coming across the border at Del Rio a couple of weeks ago could have been interrupted.

The Dallas Morning News, on Sunday, had a story about how 250 buses transported Haitians from Central America up to the lower Rio Grande Valley. Could our Department of Homeland Security not have had some visibility on who was renting 250 buses to bring the 15,000 people to the southern border? Maybe they could have spent some of that money in that regard.

I don't know if anybody has noticed, but gas is $1 a gallon more than it was 9 months ago. We are in for a cold winter, Mr. Speaker. It would be nice to have some provisions to deal with that cold winter, but this administration has turned a blind eye to the energy needs of our constituents in this country.

It is almost as if they wanted to harm the people of this country. I know that is not true. I know them to be good people. But at the same time, what I hear from my constituents is an incredible amount of frustration with what is coming from the administration and what is coming from the Congress. It is time we took care of the needs of the American people, and we ought to get on with it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman, my colleague on the Rules Committee, none of what he just stated has anything to do with what we are debating here today. What we are debating here today is whether or not we are going to pay the bills that have been accumulated, whether we are going to pay the bills accumulated as a result of an unpaid-for tax cut, mostly for wealthy people, and other spending.

The gentleman complains about gas prices. Imagine what is going to happen to gas prices if we default on our debt, if we destroy the entire economy. Imagine the harsh impacts on everyday, average citizens.

All of the other stuff is nice rhetoric, but we are talking about here today whether or not we should pay the bills that many on the other side voted to accumulate. But now, all of a sudden, they don't want to pay the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the news today that Mr. YARMUTH will not be running for reelection, and I think it is a sad day for this institution. He conducts himself with grace, with dignity, always sticking to the facts, and he has a demeanor about him that I think all of us should try to emulate. It is kind of sad to hear that news today, but I do admire him greatly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for both yielding and for his kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, this is what our Republican colleagues won't tell the American people: The debt ceiling does not control spending. It is raised, as has been said multiple times now, to cover the debt we have already incurred.

In this case, a lot of that debt is from the 2017 Trump tax scam. Our Republican colleagues will tell you they voted to cover that debt. But here is the deal: That massive giveaway to wealthy corporations and individuals has a price tag of nearly $2 trillion.

This year, it added $271 billion to the debt. Republicans are refusing to pay that bill. Next year, it will add another $243 billion to the debt. Are Republicans going to pay that bill? How about in fiscal 2024 or fiscal 2025 or fiscal 2026?

They refuse to vote to pay those bills. This whole debate about the debt ceiling has become a dangerous lie, a very dangerous lie.

The truth is, the debt ceiling needs to be repealed or at least it needs to be reformed so we can put an end to this political brinkmanship that will continue to threaten our economy and the livelihoods of American families for years. It is time to end this charade.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as we hear so much about this wonderful bipartisan history of this debt ceiling, I just want to point out that the last five times Republicans controlled the House, Senate, and the White House, the current Speaker and the entire current Democratic leadership only voted to raise the debt limit one time. So I wish that we would make sure that we point out the accurate history of how this has happened.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

□ 1700

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for pointing out the truth. I am glad that I decided to wear my boots today because it is getting deep in the swamp up here today, listening to the garbage on the other side of the aisle.

Let's put it this way: The Democrats have already pushed through $2 trillion of reckless, wasteful spending at the expense of working-class Americans, and now they are wanting to push through another $4.3 trillion reckless spending bill that will reward their political friends, their wealthy donors, and their allies, at the expense of working-class Americans.

Let me tell you, the Budget Committee chairman said we should increase the debt limit a gazillion dollars—a gazillion.

We have folks on the other side of the aisle just in the last 30 minutes that have said we should not have a debt limit. This is the Democratic Party. They do not believe there should be limit in debt. They have said this on the floor. But that is not what the American people want.

If you want to raise the debt $480 billion until December, guess what? Listen to the White House. Just last week, the White House said there is $480 billion of unobligated funds from your Biden bailout bill from March. Use that.

But, no, you want to continue to take more money from working-class Americans by putting in debt their kids and grandkids. Of course, on the other side of the aisle, they will tell you: Oh, we will never pay back the debt. That is what comes from the other side of the aisle.

Folks, we have so many crises right now: a border crisis, an Afghanistan crisis, an inflation crisis, an energy crisis, all as a result of Joe Biden, NANCY PELOSI, and CHUCK SCHUMER. And now they are trying to increase the debt $480 billion more that will fuel those crises.

The American people have had enough.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, you wonder why people hate Congress. I mean, we have somebody on the Budget Committee who is trying to make us believe that, in fact, raising the debt limit somehow controls spending.

The bottom line is the debt limit is about paying the bills that have already been accumulated, including many of the bills that my friend who just spoke voted to accumulate, including a tax cut bill that benefited the well off and the well connected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), the distinguished chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation to pay America's bills and avoid a catastrophic default.

Raising the debt ceiling doesn't incur new debts. It simply allows the Treasury Department to continue to pay the debts that this Congress already voted to incur.

Ninety-seven percent of the debt subject to the current increase was passed before President Biden took office.

The big drivers of this debt limit increase were the CARES Act programs we all supported, higher defense spending under the previous President, and enormous Republican tax cuts that were not paid for, which mostly went to the wealthy.

Since 1960, Congress has raised the debt ceiling 78 times, mostly when a Republican was in the White House.

Mr. Speaker, this has always been a bipartisan vote. In 2017, when Donald Trump was President, more than 90 percent of the Democrats voted to increase the debt limit. In 2019, when Donald Trump was President, more than 90 percent of the Democrats voted to increase the debt limit.

It should be a bipartisan vote now. The simple fact is, if it wasn't, if Congress fails to raise the debt ceiling, it would mean we refuse to pay our debts, and that would lead to destruction.

I am confused, too. In one way, this is very asymmetric. We help the Republican Presidents, but they refuse to help us. I don't understand that.

My friend from South Carolina, in front of the Rules Committee, said this is because of the Build Back Better bill, the proposed $3.5 trillion that is coming. That fails to recognize that during the Trump administration, the U.S. Federal debt went up $7.8 trillion, more than the theoretical maximum of Build Back Better.

But even more importantly, Build Back Better would not add one penny to the Federal deficit. We have worked very hard to raise revenues from the people who can most afford it, whose lives would not be diminished one iota by the revenues that we would raise.

Millions of Americans would lose their jobs if this debt ceiling doesn't go through. The unemployment rate would shoot upward to 9 percent; payments would cease for Social Security recipients, veterans, and hospitals that take Medicare and Medicaid; and our Federal workforce and our troops wouldn't be paid.

Ten years ago, the Government Accountability Office said the U.S. had to pay an extra $1.3 billion in borrowing costs because of debt limit brinkmanship.

If you want to address the debt, the obvious way to do it is to pay for your spending, to be fiscally responsible. That is exactly what my Democratic colleagues are doing with the Build Back Better bill, where my colleagues and I on the Ways and Means Committee spent many, many months figuring out how to best pay for these investments.

It is pretty ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, that the party that claimed a $2 trillion handout to the wealthy would pay for itself, mostly in dividends and stock buybacks, now complains about the debt.

If you are really worried about the debt, there are ways to address it without taking a wrecking ball to the U.S. economy.

Preventing a recession should have unanimous support in this body. It is a concerning prospect that we will have to do all this again in 2 or 3 months, and Republican leaders are already promising even stronger opposition to avoiding the self-inflicted destruction of our economy.

Sooner or later, if we don't all recognize the risks and take an adult, responsible approach to governance, the worst will happen, and we will default.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, today Washington is once again kicking the can down the road. We are adding nearly $2 million in debt per minute.

What is this institution doing about it? Kicking the can down the road, while at the same time the Democrats across the aisle want to spend trillions more.

By borrowing another $480 billion, Speaker PELOSI and President Biden are simply kicking the can down the road. We can't continue to avoid our responsibilities and spend ourselves into oblivion.

Those across the aisle are not being honest with the American people who are going to have to ultimately pay for this.

This is not responsible. Prices for workers, families, and seniors continue to rise because of Washington's out-of-control spending. Yet, Washington refuses to take accountability for its spending problem.

Today's vote will simply kick the can down the road once again and fail to get our spending here in Washington under control.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. We must stop the out-of-control spending in Washington.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and my friends on the other side of the aisle.

The good news is that Democrats, and I hope some good friends, some Republicans, will not kick American families down the aisle and down the road. That is why we are here today, to ensure that those human beings will not be kicked down the road.

I am stunned by the actions of my friends that would not support the paying of your bills.

Let us not discard the reality of what lifting the debt ceiling means. It is the bills that have already accrued. It is the light bill; it is the telephone bill; it is the heat bill; it is the tuition for college. Those are bills that have accrued that we are paying for. That is the example the American people ask.

Then we are trying to work together to ensure that lead poisoning that is killing our children in water—that the INVEST Act is ready to go with the Build Back Better, that broadband is ready to go with the Build Back Better.

Then, of course, we want to do something innovative. The housing crisis in

America is unbelievable. Homelessness is on the rise. Veterans who have pledged their life to us as Americans and who have put on the uniform unselfishly are homeless in droves. They are homeless in big cities, like Houston, Los Angeles, New York, and Chicago, and in rural areas. None of that is attributed to local leaders.

When I was home yesterday interacting with the engine of the economy—construction companies and workers and engineers—they begged for having us come together, INVEST Act, Build Back Better. This bill includes a $35 billion investment in the HOME Investment Partnerships.

We want to make sure that Medicare is strong, Federal Medicaid. We want housing, climate change, the immigration reform. There are many elements that will stop pushing the American people down the road like a can and just keep saying to them: We will get it one day. We will get it another day.

Provide education for all those workers who were stymied during the pandemic. Stop the eviction of individuals who I saw come out into the street.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The New York Times.

[From the New York Times, October 8, 2021]

WHAT THE DEBT CEILING MEANS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY AND MORE

The federal government is about two weeks away from being unable to pay its bills—and that could delay benefit payments to tens of millions of retirees, Medicare and Medicaid providers, and numerous others receiving checks from the U.S. Treasury.

Running into the federal borrowing limit could lead to a catastrophic default on the nation's debt. Once the government reaches the ceiling—and exhausts all other measures to keep payments flowing—it will run out of funds for bills it has already promised to pay.

To avoid such a calamity, Democrats are weighing a change to filibuster rules in order to hold a vote. Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the minority leader, has suggested allowing a temporary increase until December, although that would merely postpone a default deadline for a matter of weeks.

The government has never defaulted on its obligations, so what would happen is unclear. But the effects could be wide-ranging, covering programs as varied as Social Security benefits and school lunches.

''There is no public playbook for what to do when you breach the debt limit,'' said Marc Goldwein, senior policy director at the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, a fiscal watchdog group. ''We don't know what will happen.''

WHAT PROGRAMS COULD BE AFFECTED?

A lot, covering a lot of people.

A default could potentially—but not necessarily—delay the payment of Social Security benefits, which reach about 65 million Americans in some form.

It could also delay payments to government contractors, including hospitals that accept patients who use Medicare and Medicaid benefits. If the situation dragged on for weeks or months, it could threaten access to health care, Whitney Tucker, the deputy director of research on the State Fiscal Policy team at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, said in a recent note.

Some state-run programs that use federal money, like those providing free or reduced-cost breakfast and lunch to low-income students, might not be immediately reimbursed. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, formerly known as food stamps, would also be affected.

And it would probably halt payments being made to families under the newly expanded child tax credit, which in July began sending eligible families half of the credit in monthly installments. Roughly 35 million families received the benefit in July.

WHEN COULD THIS HAPPEN?

That's not totally clear. The Treasury secretary, Janet L. Yellen, has said the government will hit the debt ceiling on Oct. 18. But some analysts believe the actual date could be pushed back a few days, or perhaps longer.

It's important to note that this situation is different from a government shutdown, which happens when Congress fails to pass bills that permit new spending. White House officials warn that running into the debt ceiling is far more damaging.

WON'T THE GOVERNMENT STILL HAVE SOME MONEY?

Yes, the Treasury will have some revenue coming in—from estimated quarterly income taxes, excise taxes and other sources—but the department has maintained that it does not have the authority to pick and choose which payments it will make.

''There is only one viable option to deal with the debt limit: Congress needs to increase or suspend it, as it has done approximately 80 times, including three times during the last administration,'' a Treasury spokesman said.

But if no agreement is reached, some policy experts say that the Treasury may ultimately have to pick winners and losers—and that's a difficult bind, because there are several conflicting laws at play.

The law says the government cannot borrow once it hits the debt limit, but the 14th Amendment to the Constitution says that the United States must honor its obligations. Other laws state that certain benefits and salaries must be paid.

IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE THE GOVERNMENT COULD DO?

The Treasury might decide to issue more bonds anyway and leave it to the Supreme Court to figure out the constitutional questions, said Len Burman, an institute fellow at the Urban Institute.

''They could ignore the debt limit,'' he said. ''It is a question that has never been adjudicated because it hasn't come up before.''

But previous administrations have rejected that approach, he said, and legal experts don't agree about whether it would actually work.

WHAT ABOUT SOCIAL SECURITY?

Social Security—which reaches tens of millions of Americans through retirement, disability and survivor benefits—is a bit different from other programs because it is largely financed through a dedicated payroll tax. It also has its own trust funds, which may give it more flexibility, some experts said.

The taxes coming into the program aren't enough to pay all of the benefits, according to Jason J. Fichtner, chief economist at the Bipartisan Policy Center, who held several positions, including acting principal deputy commissioner, at the Social Security Administration. But since the checks are sent out on a staggered basis, the agency could wait for more cash to come in, which would result in delayed payments.

But there's also at least one other possibility. If the Treasury redeemed the special-issue bonds from the program's trust fund to pay benefits—and then quickly replaced them with newly issued bonds—that wouldn't raise the debt ceiling, Mr. Fichtner argues.

It's not clear whether the Treasury agrees with his assessment.

WHAT ELSE COULD HAPPEN?

If the United States were to default on its debts—that is, stop making payments on the Treasurys it has sold—there would almost certainly be major consequences in the global markets.

The immediate effect would be that portfolios held by investors as varied as pension funds and holders of 401(k)s would face a market tailspin. Even after any debt-ceiling standoff were resolved, global investors would demand higher interest payments on U.S. Treasury bonds—so the government's borrowing in the future could become more expensive.

A default may also make it more difficult for consumers to secure loans, and they would most likely pay more when they did.

''In the case of a debt default, it would quickly spark a credit crunch so the issue for borrowers becomes much more about whether you can get a loan in the first place,'' said Greg McBride, chief financial analyst at Bankrate.com. ''Lenders would likely freeze or cut credit lines on home equity lines of credit and credit cards. Personal loans would be harder to get and could see higher rates.''

WHAT IF THE PROBLEM ISN'T QUICKLY RESOLVED?

An extended impasse would cause significant damage to the U.S. economy, Wendy Edelberg and Louise Sheiner, both senior fellows at the Brookings Institution, a research group, wrote in a recent report.

''Even in a best-case scenario where the impasse is short-lived, the economy is likely to suffer sustained—and completely avoidable—damage, particularly given the challenges that Covid–19 poses to the health of the economy,'' they wrote.

If it dragged on through November, the federal government would have little choice but to significantly slash government spending by roughly $200 billion—a ''devastating'' blow to the economy, Mark Zandi, chief economist of Moody's Analytics, said in a recent analysis.

And the increased expense of borrowing would only add to the hit in the long run.

''Americans would pay for this default for generations,'' he said.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from Forbes.

[From Forbes, Oct. 4, 2021]

DEFAULTING ON THE NATIONAL DEBT CEILING WOULD BE CATASTROPHIC FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

Here we go again. It seems every time this issue arises, lawmakers seem intent to put the U.S. economy and small businesses at risk.

Unfortunately, the U.S. Department of Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen has said that the federal government will run out of money on October 18 if the debt ceiling is not raised. The government reached its debt limit at the end of July and Treasury has been taking steps to keep from defaulting. If the debt ceiling is not raised in the coming weeks, the U.S. will default on its debt for the first time in its history and that will be catastrophic for small businesses.

There is no question that our national debt needs to be addressed in the coming years with a mixture of revenue raises and spending cuts as the Clinton Administration did in the 1990s. However, defaulting on the debt is not the answer. It will not be some teachable moment on government spending. Instead, it will have unnecessary and irreversible consequences for most all Americans. A Navigator survey also found that 58 percent of Americans support raising the debt ceiling. Unfortunately, this has become a political issue. Just a few days ago, Senate Minority Leader McConnell blocked Democrats from using a simple majority to get this done.

Why? Republicans may want to use this as a campaign issue against Democrats this coming fall trying to claim that they are growing the national debt. But, the real story is, the national debt has risen regardless of which party is in control. There will be a time when Republicans will be in the driver's seat and need to raise the debt limit, and let's hope Democrats move beyond politics because playing ''chicken'' with the debt limit is not good politics, not good for small business, not good for our national security, and not good for the economy. In fact, an analysis by Moody's Analytics chief economist Mark Zandi estimates that defaulting on the national debt would wipe out as many as 6 million jobs and erase $15 trillion in household wealth.

''We can't emphasize enough how disastrous it would be for Congress to consider a government shutdown if consensus cannot be met in advance of the funding deadline. Small businesses are especially vulnerable and many would not survive a government shutdown at this time due to the pandemic, particularly with the rapid spread of the Delta variant, and trying to move from crisis to recovery,'' wrote Candace Waterman, President and CEO of Women Impacting Public Policy, in a letter to U.S. House and Senate leadership.

Here are five ways defaulting on the national debt would harm Main Streets across the country.

1. More Expensive Small Business Loans

A majority of credit rating agencies rate the U.S. federal government at AAA, the highest level. Defaulting on the debt would lead to an automatic downgrade of the country's credit rating, driving up interest rates for all Americans. Small business loans will become costlier as private lenders are forced to increase their interest rates. Even Small Business Administration (SBA)-guaranteed loans, which are often lower cost and more accessible but still reflective of market conditions, will become more expensive.

2. Higher Credit Card Interest Rates

Many small business owners use their personal credit cards to cover business expenses and manage debt. As with loan rates, small business credit card and personal credit card interest rates will also rise, squeezing the amount of capital small business owners have to work with and potentially driving them into more debt.

3. Tightened Credit Markets

One can look at the stories of Argentina and Greece to see what happens to a country's credit markets when it defaults' on its debt. The same will be the case for the United States if it follows in these countries' footsteps. Credit markets will tighten up and U.S. banks will prioritize lending to businesses where they have pre-existing relationships, which are more likely to be larger ones than small ones. Small businesses, especially unbanked ones and those in underserved communities, would be at a severe disadvantage when they have the least financial cushion.

4. Plunging Stock Markets

Moody's Report estimates that stock prices would likely plunge by one-third, sparking that $15 trillion loss in household wealth. This would be a one-two punch for small business owners who would see their own retirement savings dissipate and then lose business from consumers who are now dealing with their lost nest egg. In turn, larger public companies could lose value, thus making it harder to incorporate small businesses into their vendor supply chain.

5. Delayed Treasury Payments

The Treasury Department has been taking steps to meet its obligations, including payments to households such as Social Security. If the U.S. default on its debt, the government would immediately need to stop more than 40 percent of expected payments, including Social Security and other household income. There are a number of downstream effects this would have on small businesses, including a loss of customers and a strain on business owners and employees now taking steps to make ends meet for themselves and their loved ones.

The American economy and its Main Streets are working through their greatest crisis since World War II. Both are still standing right now but a default on the national debt would be a knockout blow. Let's stop playing politics and get the debt limit raised. Once that's done, we can return to the important work of getting an infrastructure bill passed that has the ability to pave the way for the next generation of American small businesses and entrepreneurs.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let us do the debt extension that the Senate has given us, but let us not accept this paltry extension. Do it right in December and save the American people. Build Back Better and the INVEST Act, do it together. Do it now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Rule governing debate of H.R. 2119, the "Family Violence and Prevention Services Improvement Act," H.R. 3992, the "Protect Older Job Applicants Act," H.R. 3110, the "Pump for Nursing Mothers Act," and the Senate Amendment to the House Amendment to S. 1301, "Temporary Extension of Public Debt Act."

SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 1301 TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT ACT

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary, on Homeland Security, and on the Budget, I rise in support of the rule governing debate for RCP 117–16, the Senate Amendment to the House Amendment to S. 1301, "Temporary Extension of Public Debt Act," a temporary stopgap measure raising the national debt limit by $480 billion and extending it through December 3, 2021, which is imperative to avoid a wasteful, irresponsible, reckless threatening of the nation's singular indispensable asset: the full faith and credit of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, preserving the full faith and credit of the United States by raising to the debt limit to ensure that America pays the bills for past expenditures when they come due is not a partisan exercise but an act of patriotism, a recognition and embrace of the solemn obligation to preserve the unrivaled advantages that flow from the ability provided in the Article I, Section 8, clause 2 of the Constitution to "borrow money on the credit of the United States."

Long ago, in 1789, Alexander Hamilton, the nation's first and greatest Treasury Secretary, understood that the path to American prosperity and greatness lay in its creditworthiness which provided the affordable access to capital needed to fund internal improvements and economic growth.

It is because of the existence and wise use of the Borrowing Power that the nation was able to expand its reaches, resources, and riches by financing the Louisiana Purchase, the purchase of Alaska from Russia, to fund the investments to end the Great Depression, to finance the mobilization of resources needed in World War II to defeat fascism and save freedom in the nation and the world, to revive the economy after the catastrophic Great Recession of 2008, and most recently, to protect the public health and safety and restore the economy during the COVID–19 pandemic.

This is why the ability to borrow money on the credit of the United States to finance its growth and protect its people and interests is essential to the national security and led Hamilton to proclaim that "the proper funding of the present debt, will render it a national blessing."

But to maintain this blessing, or to "render public credit immortal," Hamilton understood that it was necessary that: "the creation of debt should always be accompanied with the means of extinguishment."

In other words, to retain and enjoy the prosperity that flows from good credit, it is necessary for a nation to pay its bills.

The United States has never defaulted on the payment of any debt incurred, and because of the size and strength of its economic and unmatched creditworthiness, is able to borrow on the lowest and most favorable terms of any nation or entity in the history of the world.

So secure and reliable is a bond issues by the Department of Treasury that the United States is the preferred haven for investments of foreign governments, corporations, and sovereign wealth funds.

The interest rate charged the federal government of the United States is the base for which every rate, from the prime rate charged the richest corporation to rates charged small business on purchases to the mortgages rates and students loans taken out by consumers.

If you raise the cost of borrowing for the government of the United States, you set off a chain reaction of increased interest rates for every other borrower in the United States and around the world.

This is why leading public finance experts and agencies, like Moody's Chief Economist Mark Zandi, have said it would be "cataclysmic" for the United States to default on its loan obligations.

Republicans know the debt ceiling needs to be raised; in 2019 during the Trump Administration, the Republican Senate Majority Leader marshalled Senate Republicans to vote to raise the debt ceiling, saying: "We raised the debt ceiling because America can't default[,] that would be a disaster."

Mr. Speaker, this debate over extending the debt limit is not about restraining future spending, it is about paying the bills piled up already under both Republican and Democratic administrations.

The question of raising the national debt limit does not depend on how one feels about the Build Back Better agenda, as wildly popular as it is among all Americans, Democrats, Independents, and Republicans included.

It is instead about preserving the singular asset of the United States, its enviable and unrivaled creditworthiness, to finance future investments beneficial to the national interest, like the provision of free college for two years, or $2 billion investment to reduce violence in communities approved by the Committee on the Judiciary, or investments to preserve and strengthen Medicaid expansion programs, or extend broadband to underserved rural and urban areas, an action that will be as life-changing as the rural electrification program was in the 1930s.

Mr. Speaker, if our friends across the aisle really want to shrink the deficit, reduce the national debt, practice fiscal responsibility, and bring about sustained economic growth and prosperity, there is a much better, easier, and more certain way to achieve these goals than by tampering with the U.S. Constitution.

The easier and better way is for the American people to keep a Democrat in the White House and place Democratic majorities in the House and Senate.

In the 1990s under the leadership of President Clinton the budget was balanced for four consecutive years, the national debt was paid down, the national debt, 23 million new jobs were created, and projected surpluses exceeded $5 trillion.

Under President Obama the financial crisis and economic meltdown inherited from his Republican predecessor was ended, the annual deficit was reduced by 67 percent, the auto industry was saved from collapse, and 15 million jobs were created.

In contrast, under every Republican administration since President Reagan the size of the deficit bequeathed to his successor was substantially larger than the deficit he inherited, a major economic recession occurred, and economic growth was lower than it was at the beginning of his administration.

To preserve the sanctity of the full faith and credit of the United States, protect American jobs and businesses of all sizes, and ensure the continued growth of the economy, I support and urge all Members to join me in voting for the Senate Amendment to the House Amendment to S. 1301, the temporary stop-gap measure increasing the national debt limit by $480 billion and extending the public debt limit to December 3, 2021.

H.R. 2119 "FAMILY VIOLENCE AND PREVENTION SERVICES IMPROVEMENT ACT"

I rise today in support of the Rule governing debate of H.R. 2119, the "Family Violence and Prevention Services Improvement Act," which will improve the protection and prevention for Americans affected by family violence, domestic violence, and dating violence.

Through FVPSA, survivors receive services such as emergency shelter, crisis counseling, safety planning, and assistance recovering from financial abuse and housing insecurity.

The FVPSA supports life-saving services throughout the country via grants to states, tribal governments, and territories through three primary sets of activities, all of which are administered by HHS.

First, the FCPSA funds a national domestic violence hotline receives calls for assistance related to this violence. The hotline provides crisis intervention and counseling, maintains a database of service providers, and provides referrals for victims and others affected by domestic violence.

Second, FVPSA funds efforts to prevent domestic violence through a program known as Domestic Violence Prevention Enhancement and Leadership Through Allies (DELTA).

Third, FVPSA supports direct services for victims and their families. Most of this funding is awarded via grants to states, territories, and tribes.

FVPSA is the only federal funding source dedicated to providing support to domestic violence shelters and programs.

FVPSA provides base core funding to support more than 1,600 local public, private, non-profit and faith-based organizations and programs in their response to the urgent needs of over 1.3 million domestic violence victims and their children.

In 2020, the National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV) found that in just one day, FVPSA-funded programs helped 76,525 victims of domestic violence.

However, over 11,000 people were unable to be served due to a lack of funding.

This shortage of funding is especially severe with shelters serving rural and marginalized populations, and increased funding and culturally-specific programs are essential to addressing the needs of these communities.

FVPSA was first passed in 1984 and was most recently reauthorized in 2010. Its authorization expired in 2015.

Mr. Speaker, this bill marks an historic effort to acknowledge and address the unique suffering of family violence survivors from marginalized communities.

We must recognize that not all survivors are a monolith.

Different communities and cultures have different perceptions of domestic violence and reactions to it—therefore different communities and cultures need different treatments and prevention measures to address domestic violence.

That is why I am proud to support this bill, which includes provisions that are tailored to these specific populations.

Such provisions include:

1. Providing new grants to local programs serving culturally specific or traditionally underserved communities;

2. Increasing access for survivors from racial and ethnic communities to services by creating a national grant program to build the capacity to address domestic violence; and

3. Increasing funding for Native American tribes by allocating tribal grants as a set-aside to acknowledge their sovereign authority.

In addition to addressing the special needs of minority communities, there is a litany of other exciting provisions in this bill that build upon the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, such as:

1. Increasing the funding authorization level to $253 million to address chronic underfunding that resulted in 11,000 people not receiving services in a single day.

2. Technologically updating the National Domestic Violence Hotline and improving hotline services for underrepresented populations.

3. Authorizing funding for tribal coalitions, which provide support to tribal domestic violence programs but are not currently authorized by statute to receive FVPSA funding.

4. Authorizing new grants of up to $150,000 to each state, territorial and tribal coalition to prevent domestic violence.

A bill of this nature is incredibly important for my home state of Texas, where it is estimated that 1 in 3 Texans will be a victim of domestic violence during their lifetime.

In Texas, 29 percent of domestic violence victims are Black despite making up only 12 percent of the population.

The share of domestic violence victims in Texas who are Native American is twice as much as the proportion of Natives in the general population.

Mr. Speaker, no member should be complacent with these egregious statistics.

With this bill's increased commitment to prevention and treatment of family violence, we are sending a message to survivors that you are not forgotten.

H.R. 3992 "PROTECT OLDER JOB APPLICANTS ACT"

Mr. Speaker, I also rise today in support of the Rule governing debate of H.R. 3992, the "Protect Older Job Applicants Act," which will amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, which prohibits age-based discrimination in hiring, to specifically prohibit employers from limiting, segregating, or classifying job applicants on the basis of age.

People of all ages, but especially older applicants, must be protected from discriminatory practices and loopholes that hurt their chances to get a job, especially as we have seen that older American workers have disproportionately experienced long-term unemployment in the COVID economy.

The federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) of 1967 was passed to prohibit age-based discrimination for current employees and job applicants.

However, two federal circuit court decisions over the last five years have ruled that some provisions of the ADEA's federal anti-age discrimination protections only applied to current employees, not job applicants.

In 2016, the 11th Circuit case Villarreal v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company held that the ADEA disparate impact statute only covers employees, but not older applicants, and in 2019, the 7th Circuit adopted the same interpretation in Kleber v. CareFusion Corporation.

The U.S. Supreme Court has declined to review the appellate court decisions.

Currently, employers, especially those within the 7th and 11th Circuits, have a valid defense to claims under the ADEA where external job applicants allege they have been negatively impacted by hiring practices on the basis of their age.

H.R. 3992 would give external candidates the express right under federal law to bring these types of claims against employers.

This bill will include the job application process in ADEA's anti-discrimination provisions.

Specifically, this bill will make it unlawful "to limit, segregate, or classify . . . [job applicants] in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as . . . [a job applicant], because of such individual's age."

According to the AARP, 1 in 4 workers age 45 and older have been subjected to negative comments about their age from supervisors or coworkers, and 76 percent see age discrimination as a hurdle to finding a new job.

In one University of California, Irvine, study, résumés were sent out on behalf of more than 40,000 fictitious applicants of different ages for thousands of low-skill jobs like janitors, administrative assistants and retail sales clerks in 12 cities.

This study found that the older the applicant was, the fewer callbacks the applicant received.

This study also found that age discrimination has the highest impact on women, who suffer more age discrimination then men starting in their 40s.

According to David Neumark, a professor of economics who oversaw the study, "[t]he evidence of age discrimination against women . . . pops out in every study" conducted on age discrimination.

Ageism is still very much present in our society, and it is important we acknowledge that we still have much work to do to correct this bias and give every job applicant a fair and equal opportunity when applying for a job.

H.R. 3110 "PUMP FOR NURSING MOTHERS ACT"

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 3110, the "Pump for Nursing Mothers Act," which will close an unintentional loophole in the 2010 Break Time for Nursing Mothers Act.

The 2010 law requires employers to provide break time and a place for hourly wage-earning and some salaried employees to express breast milk at work for one year after the birth of the employee's child.

Unfortunately, this law unintentionally excluded a quarter of all working women—nearly nine million employees—from protection.

H.R. 3110 closes this coverage gap by extending the law's protections to cover salaried employees as well as other categories of employees currently exempted from protections, such as teachers, nurses, and farmworkers.

H.R. 3110 would also provide employers clarity on paid and unpaid pumping time.

The bill leaves in place existing law protecting many salaried workers from having their pay docked and clarifies that employers must pay an hourly employee for any time spent pumping if the employee is also working.

Lastly, the bill would ensure that nursing mothers have access to remedies that are available for other violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

New parents face an incredible amount of increased difficulties while juggling work, family and mental and emotional tolls that are exacerbated as a new parent.

According to a study published in Reviews in Obstetrics and Gynecology, breastfeeding provides health benefits for not only infants, but also for mothers.

Abstaining from breastfeeding has been associated with an increase in developing various types of cancers, type 2 diabetes, heart attacks, retained gestational weight gain and metabolic syndrome in adult women.

For infants, not being breastfed is associated with infectious illnesses such as pneumonia, ear infections, gastroenteritis, and can increase the risk of developing childhood-onset obesity, type 1 and 2 diabetes, leukemia and SIDS.

This bill will ensure that mothers will no longer be forced to choose between their own health, their infant's health, and their income.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act will alleviate the disparities that currently exist between breastfeeding employees and their coworkers, sending a clear message that the workforce will protect and support women who opt to balance a career and motherhood.

For these reasons, I encourage all Members to support the Rule governing debate for H.R. 2119, the "Family Violence and Prevention Services Improvement Act," H.R. 3992, the "Protect Older Job Applicants Act," and H.R. 3110, the "Pump for Nursing Mothers Act."

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I continue to hear from my colleagues across the aisle this notion that debt limit votes are always bipartisan.

I just want to point out again, however, that in the last 20 years there were five occasions where the party in power had to pass the debt limit through the Senate by themselves. This includes when then-Senator Biden and Senator SCHUMER voted against raising the debt ceiling under President George W. Bush.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for exposing that facts are very stubborn things.

Mr. Speaker, what am I missing here? The Democrat leadership just lectured us on how critical it is for all of us to vote for their huge debt ceiling increase as an obligation, as our duty.

Yet Democrat leadership, we are showing, has voted against debt ceilings many times. I have quotes here from their commentary. It would create uncertainty in the overall economy, leading to job-destroying credit downgrades, et cetera, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker, this is hypocrisy, and my constituents and the American people are very tired of it.

As well, to say that this debt ceiling is for past bills is false. Let's then set the debt ceiling at a responsible level, not at the level which just happens to accommodate the $5 trillion-plus planned reconciliation tax-and-spend bill they are working on.

Asking us to raise a credit card limit trillions and have no say at all in how it is spent, Mr. Speaker, that is irresponsible, and I won't be part of it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Minnesota, yes, individual Democrats on occasion have voted "no" on the debt ceiling, and the party in control ends up carrying the day.

But I guess I would ask her, does she know how many times Democrats threatened to filibuster the raising of the debt ceiling in the Senate to make it virtually impossible for the party in control to be able to pass it?

I am happy to yield to her, but the answer to that is zero. Zero.

I said this before when we debated this a couple of weeks ago. You know, I don't expect my Republican friends to do the responsible thing, but I expect them to get out of the way so that we can. That is what is at stake here today.

Again, let me remind all my colleagues what happens if, in fact, we don't extend the debt limit. Again, according to the nonpartisan Moody's Analytics, Mark Zandi says such a crisis could result in a loss of 6 million U.S. jobs, and $15 trillion in household wealth would be wiped out. Obviously, it is something that we cannot easily recover from, if we could ever recover from it, especially after the coronavirus pandemic.

Let me just say, I am so happy to hear that my Republican friends finally have seen the light on the debt. Where have you been? Where were you when Donald Trump brought his tax cut bill for the well off and the well connected? You had no problem at all piling on $2 trillion to the debt. Remember the debate we had on the floor? No big deal, no big deal.

I mean, would you reconsider that vote now? Or do you want to take back the vote that many of you cast—I think wisely so—to help provide COVID relief money to families that were struggling because of the worst pandemic in our lifetimes? Do you want to take that back?

Come on. This debate is embarrassing. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1715

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, to answer my friend's question about would we do this again on tax cuts, the answer is absolutely.

We grew the economy. We created jobs. We lifted 6 million people out of poverty. And guess what—2 years in a row, we have record revenues in the Treasury coffers to bring down our deficits and our national debt, which by the way, is the greatest threat to this country and the prospects of our children inheriting the blessings of liberty and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, but instead of putting that as the central issue of debate today, we are here—we flew from all over the country—to vote to raise the debt ceiling, but it is buried in a bill that has family violence, nursing mothers, protecting old job applicants. I don't know what costume party I have arrived at here in Washington, but Halloween has come early here because nothing on this rule bill says, "debt limit."

It has nursing mothers—I know that my Democrat colleagues want to be involved in every facet and phase of the lives of the American people, including nursing mothers, but the reality is, we are broke. Our budget process is completely dysfunctional. We ought to be talking about spending caps, no budget, no recess, debt targets; things that we could work together on to actually get on a sustainable path to fiscal sanity.

But instead, we bury a debt ceiling vote—which is what this is—in a rule bill about family violence, older Americans, and nursing mothers. I mean, that is the most Washington shuck-and-jive thing I have seen in a long time. What deception. What swampiness.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the American people can't stand this institution, and they certainly can't trust this institution to do the people's business.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, oh my goodness. The gentleman says that we buried the debt limit somehow in this rule. I will lend him my glasses. It says in the title: Increase the public debt limit.

I don't know how much clearer it could be. It is in the title. Did you not read the rule?

Mr. Speaker, by the way, we met in the Committee on Rules on S. 1301 on September 29—2 weeks ago. On that same day, we debated the bill on the House floor and voted on it—up or down. Fully transparent—218 Democrats voted yes; 1 Republican voted yes; 2 Democrats voted no; 210 Republicans voted no.

It was a fully transparent process. What are you talking about?

Mr. Speaker, what we are dealing with today is a Senate amendment to that very same bill. We don't need to start the process of hearings and markups and debate all over again for a Senate amendment to a bill that we have already debated and voted on—and by the way, a Senate amendment that was inspired by MITCH MCCONNELL, the Republican leader.

So don't just come here and make stuff up. The debt limit is in the title of the rule, for goodness sake.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that my colleague from the Committee on Rules points out that we did debate this bill, S. 1301, a couple of weeks ago. But he also pointed out that there is a Senate amendment that was added to it that we are not debating right now. So it is not entirely the same bill that we talked about 2 weeks ago. I wanted to make sure that was pointed out because it is not the same bill.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, there is lots of discussion and input that people want to have on this debt ceiling issue, and I really do feel the need to say it again: this is an irresponsible way to run Congress. And the Democrats are not giving this debt limit extension the proper debate. What we are actually debating right now is the rule. We are not debating the actual issue of the debt ceiling and talking about it in depth, as we should be. I wanted to make sure that the American people understood that that is what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in my office, and I couldn't help hearing that this is kitchen table economics, so I just want to reduce it down to what kitchen table economics actually is.

This is a country that has an income of about $3.5 trillion a year. Meaning, if you were a regular family, that means you make about $35,000 a year. Let's reduce it to kitchen table economics.

But we then turn around and spend $6.5 trillion, so that is telling the average family back home: Mr. and Mrs. America, understand something, you make $35,000 a year. You should be spending $65,000 a year and just increasing your total debt.

We are at right now is between funded and unfunded liabilities. America is on the hook for $130 trillion. This is a pathway to destruction. Now we are going to point fingers back and forth: Well, you guys raised it, and you should have raised it.

Mr. Speaker, you know what? There is no such thing as a debt ceiling here. There is no debt ceiling here. This is a sunroof. All we do is open it any time we want to irresponsibly spend money, and we just go ahead and keep spending and spending.

It all falls on the backs of not only our grandchildren and our children but also on this current generation. This is absolutely insane and totally irresponsible.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am hearing two things from the other side.

One, is that they are fine with ignoring the debt if it is on things that they like. And then two, I am hearing that they are fine with defaulting on the debt, therefore throwing our economy into ruin. Talk about irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the distinguished majority leader for sharing with us he has voted 49 times to raise the debt ceiling, because when he came into this body, the debt was about $1 trillion. Today it is $28.5 trillion.

So thank you—I guess—on behalf of the people of America who are staring at $28.5 trillion of debt.

Here is the thing: My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are asking us to support a half-a-trillion-dollar increase in the debt—half a trillion dollars. And the American people can't even keep up with what those numbers even mean. But they do know that those dollars are being used to fund government tyranny over their lives.

That is what those dollars are being used for—for a border that is not secure; for cartels that are ripping into Texas; for critical race theory being taught to our children; to not fund police; to have the FBI going after parents and school boards; vax mandates; shutting down businesses; forcing people to comply or they lose their job; energy poverty, preventing people from actually getting the energy to heat their homes, drive their cars, and go to work. That is what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want us to borrow half a trillion dollars to keep funding.

So please forgive me if I vote ''no'' to rack up more debt for my kids and grandkids, to fund the tyranny over the minds and the hearts of the American people that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle wish to continue to fund. And no, I haven't voted for a debt ceiling increase before. And I certainly haven't 49 times to raise the debt from $1 trillion to $28.5 trillion, as has the majority leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to save my breath, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 223, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

YEAS—198

Aderholt	Ferguson	Kustoff
Allen	Fischbach	LaHood
Amodei	Fitzgerald	LaMalfa
Armstrong	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Arrington	Fleischmann	Latta
Babin	Fortenberry	LaTurner
Bacon	Foxx	Letlow
Baird	Fulcher	Long
Balderson	Gaetz	Loudermilk
Banks	Gallagher	Lucas
Barr	Garbarino	Luetkemeyer
Bentz	Garcia (CA)	Mace
Bergman	Gibbs	Malliotakis
Bice (OK)	Gimenez	Mann
Biggs	Gohmert	Massie
Bilirakis	Gonzales, Tony	Mast
Bishop (NC)	Good (VA)	McCarthy
Boebert	Gooden (TX)	McCaul
Bost	Gosar	McClain
Brady	Granger	McHenry
Brooks	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Buchanan	Green (TN)	Meijer
Buck	Greene (GA)	Meuser
Bucshon	Griffith	Miller (IL)
Budd	Grothman	Miller (WV)
Burchett	Guest	Miller-Meeks
Burgess	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Calvert	Hagedorn	Mooney
Cammack	Harris	Moore (AL)
Carl	Harshbarger	Moore (UT)
Carter (GA)	Hartzler	Mullin
Carter (TX)	Hern	Nehls
Cawthorn	Herrell	Newhouse
Chabot	Herrera Beutler	Norman
Cline	Hice (GA)	Nunes
Clyde	Hill	Obernolte
Cole	Hinson	Owens
Comer	Hollingsworth	Palazzo
Crawford	Hudson	Palmer
Crenshaw	Huizenga	Pence
Curtis	Jackson	Perry
Davidson	Jacobs (NY)	Pfluger
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (LA)	Posey
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)	Reschenthaler
Donalds	Jordan	Rice (SC)
Duncan	Joyce (OH)	Rodgers (WA)
Dunn	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Ellzey	Katko	Rose
Emmer	Keller	Rosendale
Estes	Kelly (MS)	Roy
Fallon	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Feenstra	Kim (CA)	Salazar